

May 10, 1965

firms submitting bids on government contracts must be domiciled in Venezuela. In the case of foreign corporations, that requirement entails domiciliation under the provisions of Articles 354 through 358 of the Venezuelan Commercial Code. Those provisions require, among other things, the filing of certified copies of the articles of incorporation (or corresponding documents) and the by-laws of the foreign corporation and the translation into Spanish and publication of the articles of incorporation, as well as the appointment of a representative in Venezuela with full powers to act in Venezuela for the foreign corporation, except the power to dispose of the business of the corporation.

Accordingly, foreign corporations which are not already registered with a ministry or agency and are not domiciled in Venezuela are at a substantial disadvantage, particularly if the period allowed for the submission of bids is relatively short.

The protection of existing national industry and the encouragement of new industries is the declared policy of the Venezuelan Government. In furtherance of that policy, the "Buy Venezuelan" Decree of January 9, 1959 (Decree No. 512, *Gaceta Oficial*, January 13, 1959), a copy of an unofficial translation from Spanish of which is attached hereto, requires all government departments and agencies and autonomous entities and establishments to purchase Venezuelan products, provided the domestic price is not over 25% greater than that of the imported product.

Principal sources

(1) Foreign Service Despatch No. 328 dated November 3, 1961, from the United States Embassy in Caracas, entitled "EXPORT: Government Tenders".

(2) Airgram No. A-171 dated September 18, 1964, from the United States Embassy in Caracas, entitled "Rules and Regulations for Bidding on Government Contracts for Public Work".

(3) Airgram No. A-217 dated October 7, 1964, from the United States Embassy in Caracas, entitled "Venezuelan Law Governing Bids on Government Contracts".

(4) Letter dated November 12, 1964, from Bureau of International Commerce, United States Department of Commerce, to Cravath, Swaine & Moore, New York.

(5) United States Department of Commerce, Venezuela: A Market for U.S. Products (1964).

VENEZUELA

Decree No. 512 of January 9, 1959

(*Gaceta Oficial*, January 13, 1959)

(Unofficial translation from Spanish)

The Government Junta of the Republic of Venezuela, in exercise of the authority conferred upon it by its Constitutive Act, in Council of Ministers,

Whereas one of the major obstacles for our industrial and economic development consists in the insufficient capacity of the internal market;

Whereas a large part of the national consumption is vested in the Public Administration; and

Whereas as part of the protection policy which the National Government has developed in favor of the production of the country, the adoption of measures to channel the purchases of the Public Administration towards the market of national products is necessary;

Decreases:

Article 1. The Public Administration shall not be allowed to acquire goods abroad at prices which, added to the corresponding duties which regular import causes, plus a surcharge up to 25 percent ad valorem, will be higher than, or equal to, the prices paid for similar articles or adequate substitutes

in the internal market. Prices for the goods to which the article refers shall be determined in the corresponding port of entry into the country.

Article 2. Acquisitions of nationalized goods shall be subject to the provisions of the preceding article. In that case, only the surcharge provided for shall be applied to the price of said goods in the internal market.

Article 3. The Autonomous Official Institutes and Establishments of the Public Administration shall expressly be subject to the provisions of this Ordinance.

Article 4. The Industrial Council shall determine the goods to which this Decree shall be applied and the surcharges in each case.

Article 5. The provisions of this Decree shall not be applicable to cases in which the acquisition of goods produced abroad will be a particular necessity in the judgment of the Ministry of the branch in question. For this purpose, the Ministry which may have ordered or authorized the acquisition must state to the office of the Controller of the Nation the reasons on which it bases its resolution.

Article 6. When inspecting ["Al fiscalizar"] the acquisition of goods pursuant to the Law, the Office of the Controller of the Nation shall apply the provisions contained herein.

Article 7. Decree number 131 dated May 20, 1949, is hereby repealed.

Article 8. This Decree shall become effective 120 days after its publication.

Palace of Miraflores, Caracas, the ninth of January of nineteen hundred fifty nine. The 149th Year of the Independence and 100th Year of the Federation.

The Government Junta,

EDGARD SANABRIA,

President.

CENTRAL AMERICAN COMMON MARKET (CACM)

The five Central American countries—Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua—are parties to a number of agreements which comprise or relate to the Central American Economic Integration Program. The two main agreements—the General Treaty of Central American Economic Integration signed on December 13, 1960, and the Multilateral Treaty on Free Trade and Central American Economic Integration signed on June 10, 1958—deal specifically with eliminating trade barriers within the group (the "common market" or CACM), and generally with the whole problem of economic integration.

Article XVI of the General Treaty contains the following provisions with regard to national treatment for construction enterprises (unofficial United Nations translation):

"The Contracting States shall grant national treatment to enterprises of other Signatory States engaged in the construction of roads, bridges, dams, irrigation systems, electrification, housing and other works intended to further the development of the Central American economic infrastructure."

Article III of the General Treaty contains the following provision with regard to national treatment of goods (unofficial United Nations translation):

"Goods originating in the territory of any of the Signatory States shall be accorded national treatment in all of them and shall be exempt from all quantitative or other restrictions or measures, except for such measures as may be legally applicable in the territories of the Contracting States for reasons of health, security or police control."

To encourage investment, the concept of "Integrated industries" has been developed. Integrated industries are regulated by the Multilateral Agreement of June 10, 1958, which was validated by Article XVII of the

General Treaty. An integrated industry is one that, even at minimum capacity, must have access to the entire Central American market in order to operate under reasonably competitive conditions. An integrated industry is granted a number of special incentives. Article VII provides in part that "the Government and other State bodies shall also give preference in their official imports to the products of the Central American integration industries."

Like LAFTA, CACM has an Executive Council consisting of a representative from each member country, and a permanent secretariat that carries out the administrative functions. The latter is under the direction of a Secretary General. Unlike LAFTA, the supreme authority of CACM is the Central American Council, consisting of the Ministers of Economy of the five member countries.

Principal sources

(1) Association of the Bar of the City of New York, Committee on Foreign Law, Economic Integration in Latin America, 17 Record (Supplement, June 1962).

(2) Business International, Latin America's Merging Market: The Challenge of Economic Integration (New York, 1964).

(3) Duvall, Latin American Integration Developments, 9 International and Comparative Law Bulletin 34 (December 1964) (published by Section of International and Comparative Law, American Bar Association).

(4) Nattier, The Central American Program of Economic Integration, in Surrey and Shaw (eds.), A Lawyer's Guide to International Business Transactions (Philadelphia, 1963).

(5) Pincus, The Central American Common Market (U.S. Department of State, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 1962).

(6) United Nations, Multilateral Economic Cooperation in Latin America, Vol. 1: Text and documents (1962).

STRONG SUPPORT FOR ACTION TAKEN BY OUR GOVERNMENT IN VIETNAM AND IN THE CARIBBEAN OPPOSED BY CERTAIN ELEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 5 days ago today, the House of Representatives indicated its strong support for the action being taken by our Government in the Vietnam situation, as well as in the Caribbean, when we adopted legislation appropriating additional funds for the conduct of military operations in these two areas of the world. Now that the Congress is again on record in support of the President and our military leaders, it would be well to take note of some opposition to this course which became evident during the spring recess, while Members were away from Washington.

On April 17, 1965, a "march on Washington" was staged to protest our Vietnam policies and was attended by thousands of college students and others saying they are in opposition to the U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia.

While some of those in attendance may well hold sincere beliefs that U.S. action

is wrong, let no one believe that this demonstration was spontaneous or merely the identical reaction of an impartial group of young American students. The evidence clearly indicates that this march was fostered and promoted by the Communist elements in this country which are hard at work to undermine the efforts of our Government in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Six groups, in addition to the Communist Party, U.S.A., seem to have been most interested in the April 17 demonstrations. They are the Progressive Labor Party; the May 2d Movement; the Committee for Nonviolent Action; the Socialist Workers Party; the Workers World Party, and the Students for a Democratic Society.

Some members of these organizations and others who took part in the Washington demonstration, do so from personal conviction and not as followers of the Communist Party line. But they do lend their support to the efforts of the Communists is cause for concern.

Most of those participating in the Washington demonstration were college students. It would be well for every parent who has a son or daughter in college to advise their children of the real purposes they serve when they participate in such activities. Too often the parents are not familiar with the activities of their youngsters while at college. And many students apparently feel that if they are in agreement with the aims of some organization they can join in activities sponsored by these organizations, without adequate study of the real motives of these acts and their possible consequences.

The organizations which participated in the April 17 march on Washington deserve careful study.

The organization, Students for a Democratic Society, was the prime mover in the April 17 demonstration in Washington, as well as the Easter vigil at the L.B.J. ranch in Texas.

The society is the youth affiliate of the League for Industrial Democracy, the successor to the Inter-Collegiate Socialist Society which was organized in 1905 with the purpose to mobilize college professors, students, and graduates to teach socialism and collective ownership of property. The National Office of the Students for a Democratic Society is located at 119 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and the organization claims a membership of 1,700 in 44 chapters.

The society has demonstrated that it will render support to or receive support from any organization, subversive or otherwise, which has common goals with the society.

As of February 24, 1965, Charles Clark Kessinger, Jr., was national secretary of the society. In 1963 he was a student of the University of Wisconsin and made arrangements for the guest appearance of Herbert Aptheker, a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

On February 20, 1965, the society cosponsored and participated in demonstrations in Chicago and at the White House, protesting the war in Vietnam. On March 5, they cosponsored a demon-

stration in front of the Armed Services Recruiting Station at Philadelphia. On April 5, they picketed a lecture delivered at Johns Hopkins University by Presidential Adviser McGeorge Bundy. And, on April 17, in Washington and Johnson City, Tex., they demonstrated again against U.S. policies in Vietnam.

It is my understanding that they soon will bring a number of university faculty members to Washington to challenge administration officials to a debate on Vietnam policy.

Progressive Labor Party is another group participating in current demonstrations, including the one of April 17. It is extremely militant, along the Marxist-Leninist or Chinese Communist Party lines. Their magazine, *Challenge*, of February 9, 1965, said:

If we demonstrate, if the organizations we belong to demonstrate, if we show that we will not support it—if we demand in one voice that the war be ended—then Johnson will not be able to get away with it.

We can stop the war. For our own sake, we must. End the war in Vietnam. Bring the troops home.

This group was formerly known as the Progressive Labor movement, formed in 1962 by dissident elements of the Communist Party, U.S.A., led by Milton Rosen and Mortimer Scheer, both of whom held positions in the New York district of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Rosen is president and Scheer is a vice president, along with William Epton. Epton, a former Communist Party, U.S.A., member, left the party because he felt it was no longer a revolutionary power. He was instrumental in forming another Progressive Labor Party front group, the Harlem Defense Council, during the summer of 1964. He was arrested and charged with advocacy of criminal anarchy.

In addition to the *Challenge*, the Progressive Labor Party also publishes the magazine *Progressive Labor*, 500 copies of which are reportedly sent to the People's Republic of China each month. A former editor of this publication has stated that organization members have been involved in trips to Cuba in violation of a State Department ban on travel to that Communist country.

The May 2 movement also took part in the April 17 Washington demonstration. It was organized in the spring of 1964 and planned and executed a demonstration in New York City in that year demanding the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam. Currently, the movement is attempting to influence students to demonstrate for more freedom on various college campuses. The national chairman is Russell Stetler, a student at Haverford College, Pennsylvania.

This group has a film entitled "Heroic Vietnam 1963," which was reportedly made by the Vietcong and smuggled into the United States from Cuba. It contains anti-U.S. propaganda and has been shown recently at Drew University, University of Cincinnati, University of Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania State University. Of the May 2 movement, Progressive Labor has said:

The role of the May 2 movement is to oppose American imperialism throughout the world.

According to the February 8, 1965, issue of *Spark*, a newspaper issued by the Progressive Labor Party on the west coast, the May 2 movement is circulating and obtaining signatures to a declaration from young men of draft age, stating the "U.S. participation in the war is for the suppression of the Vietnamese struggle for self-determination and national independence. We herewith state our refusal to fight against the people of Vietnam." Also in February, a panel discussion was held at the Student Union Building, Michigan State University, sponsored by the Young Socialist Club where Stetler stated that the May 2 movement had obtained hundreds of signatures on one campus alone on a petition that the students would not allow themselves to be drafted for a war in Vietnam.

Committee for Nonviolent Action is another group which has been most active in protesting U.S. action in Vietnam. It has been supported by the Progressive Labor Party. It was formed in 1957 and its leaders and most of its members reportedly are ardent pacifists. While nonviolent action is the stated effort of this organization, it is interesting to note that its national chairman, A. J. Muste, was an observer at the 16th National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A. in New York City in 1957. He has long fronted for Communists and has in the past circulated an amnesty petition calling for the release of Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act.

This committee also sponsored the Quebec-Guantanamo Walk for Peace which culminated in Florida in 1964, when Government authorities seized the boat which this group intended to use to travel to Cuba. The group distributes literature calling on individuals to quit their jobs in war industry, refuse to serve in the Armed Forces, refuse to pay part of their income taxes for defense and especially to speak to any and every organization through which they can gain a platform for greater publicity. They are also distributing a document entitled "An Appeal to the Conscience of America," which claims that torture is used by our side in Vietnam, that the Vietcong are not supplied by the North Vietnamese or Red China.

Socialist Workers Party also took part in the April 17 demonstration in Washington. They follow the Trotsky line and their youth branch is known as the Young Socialist Alliance. Both have manifested their opposition to U.S. presence in Vietnam, in their publications and on college campuses and in demonstrations. They were active in a march in Boston earlier this year, protesting the Vietnam policies of this Government and also helped in the promotion of the April march in Washington. Three national leaders of the Socialist Alliance toured college campuses in the East, South, Midwest, and Far West to urge students to join the march.

Workers World Party, and its youth affiliate, Youth Against War and Fascism, have also been active. This group was formed in 1959 from a splinter group that left the Socialist Workers Party. It

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9645

reportedly has branches in Buffalo, Youngstown, Seattle, and Los Angeles and maintains headquarters in New York City. They had a delegation in Washington to participate in the April demonstration.

The Communist Party, U.S.A. exhibited its extreme interest in the April 17 demonstration by front page articles devoted to the event which appeared in the Worker. In a directive to all party districts dated March 31, 1965, the Communist Party, U.S.A. national office described the march as the "major point of concentration" in the campaign in the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam. The party districts were told that the main task was to get maximum participation in the demonstration. An estimated 15,000 individuals participated in this demonstration, including known Communist Party members from throughout the Nation. They included Arnold Johnson, public relations director and Michael Zagarell, National Youth Director of the Communist Party, U.S.A. and George Meyers, a member of the party's national committee. At the time of the Washington march, in Johnson City, Tex., 45 individuals, many identified as past or present members of the Communist Party, maintained a vigil at the President's ranch.

While all of these groups except the Communist Party itself include among their members and followers individuals who are undoubtedly well-meaning, the facts are indisputable that the denunciation of present U.S. policy in Vietnam is in accord with the Communist objectives and contrary to the best interests of the United States.

It is paradoxical that the followers of these organizations apparently place a greater trust in the propaganda emanating from Communist sources than they do in the policies of their own country. It is alarming that so many young people from our colleges could be gathered together for these demonstrations without realizing they are being used by the forces which would see us destroyed.

Sincere Americans have every right to protest any action of their Government with which they disagree. We live in a free country where every citizen has that right. Nor are we insinuating that every organization or individual who protests is an agent of the Communist Party. But knowingly or not, they are participating side by side with Communists working to bury us. That they are being used by agents of the Communist movement is apparent, and every effort must be made to acquaint the American people with the real motives behind large group actions against U.S. policies in Vietnam. No doubt we will soon see similar demonstrations regarding our stand in the Caribbean, and elsewhere, any time we stand up to Communist threats anywhere in the world. We must identify those behind these movements, call them to the attention of every citizen and make every effort to acquaint American students with the threats which are posed to the very freedoms they promote.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May has been observed as Rumanian Independence Day for the past 87 years. Rumania as a nation won recognition of her national independence at the Congress of Berlin on May 10, 1878, but only after bloody sacrifices and heroic deeds in the war between imperial Russia and the Ottoman Empire. Significantly, and ironically in light of present events, the Rumanian people turned back to the Ottoman Turks after they had inflicted two critical defeats on the imperial Army of Russian Grand Duke Nicholas. Rumania's reward was recognition of her national independence by the great powers of Europe.

It was 20 years ago last March 6 that the new imperialism of Moscow seized the Rumanian nation by fraud and violence and robbed her people of freedom and national independence. In typical Russian style, Vishinsky, an agent of the Kremlin, announced that the Rumanian Government no longer existed and that it had been replaced by a new regime, a regime of Communist puppets. This action was backed up by the tanks and guns of the Red army and occurred only after a Russian campaign of terror and violence among the Rumanian people.

From this it is obvious that the Russians have no respect for history, that to help them in their hour of crisis is to invite their ungrateful and deceitful actions at a future date. That is the lesson we learn from the events of 1877-78 when Rumania held back invasion of imperial Russia by the Ottoman Turks and the events of 1945 when imperial Russia robbed the Rumanian people of their national independence.

The United States has had its share of harsh experiences with the imperial Russians. In 1917-18 we provided Russia with military supplies and funds to defend itself against imperial Germany. From 1918 to 1921 we provided the food to prevent famine in Bolshevik Russia—hoping to win their friendship. As a reward our humanitarian program was branded as a spy operation and disbanded as soon as the threat of famine had been defeated.

In 1939 the imperial Russians and Nazi Germany made a secret pact to launch World War II and to divide all of Europe between the tyrants. When the Nazis later invaded the Russian empire, we rushed to the aid of imperial Russia and embraced her as an ally. We poured out over \$20 billion in loans and lend lease—all to save the imperial Russians from certain defeat. We fought to liberate all of Europe from the tyrants whip only to defeat Nazi Germany and then to be immediately confronted with wholesale Russian subversion and aggression directed at the conquest of all of Europe.

Every American is aware of Russian directed subversion and aggression in

Korea, Vietnam, Africa, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and elsewhere since the end of World War II. Despite this record there are people who call out for more efforts to win the friendship of the Russians. There are even people who still believe that we can win Russian friendship if we remain quiet about the fate of the people in the captive nations of Europe and Asia. But the record shows the only possible friendship with the Russians is based upon submission to their demands.

The people of Rumania know the full meaning of friendship—Russian style. They have lived under that forced friendship for 20 years. During that time they have seen the Russians liquidate their Rumanian quislings, those Rumanians whose friendship was based upon the alleged bond of Communist ideology. Communist ideology is always subservient to the demands of the Russian empire. They have experienced the plans and schemes of the Russians to change the character of the Rumanian people by remaking them into Soviet people. In other words, they have lived through the 20th century Russian nightmare and there is every reason to believe the character, the spirit, and the rich traditions of Rumanian life remain alive in the hopes and aspirations of her people.

How else can we account for recent developments in Rumania? There is no denying the fact that the Rumanian people are becoming more bold and outspoken in their opposition to Russian domination of their homeland. Popular feelings on this issue have reached such a stage that even leading members of the imposed Communist regime have made anti-Russian statements and have also made attempts to create the public impression that they are not wholly owned agents of Moscow. It is reasonable to conclude that the Russians with their reactionary system of colonizing other nations, have become so unwanted that even their trained quislings are attempting to disassociate from them.

No effort on the part of the imposed Communist regime in Rumania to convince the Rumanian people that their country is free and independent can succeed. The people know they are not free and that their national independence has been robbed by Moscow. The people of Rumania will not be satisfied until they are complete masters of their destiny, until traditional Rumanian culture is allowed to flourish and until full and open relations with the Western World are resumed.

World events are moving in a direction favorable to Rumania and the other captive nations. Russian instigated aggression through so-called wars of national liberation, such as is taking place in Vietnam and as was attempted in the Dominican Republic, has aroused the free world from its temporary slumber. Cuba has provided our people with a striking example of the end results of such wars of national liberation. That Russian base of operations in the Western Hemisphere now threatens many countries in Latin America. President

9646

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 10, 1966

Johnson's action in both Vietnam and in the Dominican crisis serves notice that we will not stand idly by while Moscow robs more nations of their freedom and independence.

Meanwhile, imperial Russia is charging the United States with imperialism for defending the freedom and independence of Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. Our actions to defend human freedom have been labeled by Moscow as acts of aggression. It is time that we exposed the nature of Russian imperialism and the manner in which the mythology of communism is used to expand the empire of Moscow.

Congress can provide the forum for that long overdue exposure by authorizing a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Such a committee could put the labels of imperialism and aggression where they properly belong—on the unchanging Russians. The one remaining empire in the world cannot stand the test of full exposure. Such an exposure would renew the hopes and aspirations of millions of non-Russian people throughout the captive nations. It would serve notice that we have not forgotten them and would be a certain assurance that we do not seek Russian friendship at the expense of continuing enslavement of the captive nations. Moreover, it would put imperial Russia on the defensive as the seat of the last vestige of colonialism and reactionary exploitation of nations and people.

The 10th of May is not being officially celebrated in Rumania today. Moscow would not permit it and the Communist regime in Bucharest could not endure the consequences. But the people of Rumania will remember this day and they will observe it in their own way despite the commands of Moscow or the counterplans of the Rumanian Communist regime. Today is Rumanian Independence Day. And it will be so observed long after the Russian nightmare is ended.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, we commemorate the anniversary of Rumanian independence. After centuries of domination by the Ottoman Empire, the people of Rumania had at long last achieved their freedom. It is fitting that we in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, take a few moments in our busy schedule of legislation to pay tribute to Rumania and to her people on this great national holiday.

The Rumanian people today, as they were before declaring their independence from the Turks, are a people living in a state of national oppression. Since 1945, Rumanians have known nothing else but the tyranny of communism and all its evil works. At the close of that last great war it was the hope of all freemen that there would no longer be any other dominating tyranny in the world. It was the hope of many who had fought in that great and terrible war that a new age had dawned for mankind.

But we were all mistaken. Our hopes were soon dashed when we observed with bitter anguish the envelopment of all eastern Europe by a new world tyranny, communism. Rumania, Poland, and all the other states of Eastern Europe fell

under the coercive ideology of communism. Freedom was destroyed, and all hope for a better future and a future in freedom was dissolved.

In the past few years great changes have taken place in the Communist world. Forces of diffusion have been at work, eroding away the once total power that the Soviets had once held over Eastern Europe. One of the states that has experienced the full impact of these changing currents of history has been Rumania. During these years Rumania has exerted to a remarkable degree its independent role within the Soviet bloc. It has insisted upon a separate economic future quite apart from the rigidly imposed structure established in Moscow. It has played off with great skill the Chinese against the Russians in the interplay of intrabloc politics, and thus have been able to establish some degree of independence from Moscow. Russian influence is on the way out in Rumania. Even the learning of the Russian language is no longer compulsory, and Western languages are gaining their pre-1945 favor in the Rumanian education system. Moreover, Rumania has been establishing greater ties with the West.

These are considerable changes. There can be no mistake about that. But it would be a mistake to read too much into these changes; for Rumania remains Communist and its government is intolerably totalitarian. Nonetheless, Rumanians are exerting greater independence from the bloc than ever before, and this in itself constitutes a diminution of overall Soviet strength in Europe.

On this anniversary of Rumanian independence, it gives satisfaction to witness these changing events in Rumania. Let us all hope that the trend will enlarge to a degree that at some time in the future Rumania and her people will at long last be free from communism itself.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the steadfastness with which the Rumanian people continue to defy their Soviet masters is emphasized by the fact that although yesterday, May 9, is decreed their national holiday, Rumanians continue to celebrate May 10, their traditional national holiday, in their hearts.

Today, the good wishes and heartfelt support of all Americans go out to the Rumanian people—those within Rumania clandestinely marking this triple observance, and those outside their homeland who are free to mark this occasion.

On May 10, 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania, thus founding the Rumanian dynasty. Eleven years later, on May 10, 1877, the principality of Rumania proclaimed her independence from the Ottoman Empire, and 4 years later, on May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

During the ensuing years, Rumanians have cherished the 10th of May as their national holiday, and today it remains the symbol of their perseverance to reach their ultimate goal of freedom and well-being. Even the oppressive Soviet rule which they have lived under since 1947 has not been able to alter the significance of this date, despite the fact that the present government decreed that May

9—the anniversary of the Soviet victory over Nazi Germany—as the official Rumanian national holiday.

To these valiant people—our allies in two World Wars, we extend our good wishes on this holiday of their hearts, and hope with them for the day when all Rumanians may again celebrate May 10 openly.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have unusual opportunities to reflect on the sad fate that has befallen some of the older nations of the world. This day Rumanian people throughout the free world are pausing to commemorate the independence of Rumania on May 10, 1877. But unfortunately the people of that nation are today not free to celebrate an independence from rule established without consent of the governed.

As a nation that during two world wars saw action alongside the Allied Powers, Rumania has to this day retained a zeal for independence and freedom. While there is presently little opportunity for genuine expression of that independence in Rumania, I am sure my colleagues will agree that no nation can long be forced to suppress its rightful goal of independence from foreign domination.

I therefore want to join my fellow Members of Congress in saluting the Rumanian people on this anniversary. And I take this opportunity also to assure the people of Rumania that the United States still remembers the gallantry of its service with the Allies and to wish them a quick return to earlier days of freedom and independence.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, throughout its history Rumania has been at the crossroads between East and West. Partly for this reason, and partly because of the fact that the country is both fertile and rich in natural resources, Rumania remained divided among her powerful neighbors for nearly 400 years up to the latter half of the 19th century. During all that time, since its conquest by the Ottoman Turks in the 15th century, Rumania was part of the Ottoman Empire, and Rumanians were subjected to the oppressive rule of Ottoman sultans. Through Turkish misgovernment and misrule Rumanians suffered greatly, but they never gave up their ideals, and they worked hard for the attainment of the national goal, their freedom.

In the middle of the last century, after the Crimean War, they attained part of their goal. In 1856, Rumania secured autonomous status, and its only direct tie with the Ottoman sultan was the payment of annual tribute to the sultan's treasury. But the Rumanian people wanted to get rid of this one remaining tie, and the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 offered them the opportunity to do this. When that war was raging, on May 10, 1877, the Rumanians proclaimed their full independence of Turkey and fought for its realization. The Rumanian forces joined the Russians in that war against the Turks, and at the end of the war their newly won independence was recognized by the Congress of Berlin. Such was the rise of free and independent Rumania 88 years ago.

Since those exultant days Rumanians have had their ups and downs. They were involved in the First World War, fighting on the side of the Allied and associated powers, and in the end succeeded in having their territorial claims recognized by the formation of a greater Rumania. They were then quite content with their lot and were doing well during the interwar years. They were also involved in the last war, and they were the victims of both Nazi and Soviet aggressions. Before the actual end of that war Rumania was brought into the clutches of the Kremlin, and for nearly two decades Rumanians suffered more under unrelenting Communist totalitarianism than they had under other alien rules in the past. The rich resources of the country were taken over by Soviet authorities, and were exploited by them. A Communist system of government, with all its attendant evils, was imposed upon the Rumanian people. Collectivization, regimentation, and nationalization were carried out with an iron hand and the people had no choice but to obey the dictatorial decrees.

Until recent years the country was practically sealed off from the West, and Rumanians were prisoners in their own country. They endured many hardships and prayed for their liberation from Communist tyranny. Fortunately, today there is considerable change for the better. The iron hand of communism is somewhat relaxed; in matters of trade and commerce they seem to have regained some freedom, and the country is not as effectively sealed off from the West as it was until a few years ago. On the 88th anniversary of Rumanian Independence Day let us all hope and pray that this spirit of relaxation and toleration will continue and eventually the Rumanian people will regain their full freedom.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on the 10th of May, the anniversary of the day in 1877 when the Rumanians proclaimed their liberty from the Turks, our thoughts turn to the Rumanian people of today. Although the dissension in the Communist world and the rift between the Soviet Union and Communist China have recently permitted Rumania a slight margin for nationalistic action, Rumania is still a captive nation of the Soviet Union. The Rumanian people are still under the control of communism, an alien movement which could never stay in power without the proximity of the Red army. They suffer from the failings of Communist economic and agricultural policies. For example, 90 percent of Rumania's agriculture is collectivized and the yields remain pathetically low in sharp contrast to the bountiful surpluses of our own farms.

As Rumanians who live in the free world and Americans of Rumanian descent celebrate the anniversary of Rumanian independence, it is my hope that the people of Rumania will be heartened by the evidence that their plight has not been forgotten. It is my hope that they too will remember that their ancestors lived under foreign domination for more than four centuries, yet they were at last successful in regaining their independence.

The United States, which will always be stronger because of the contributions made by its citizens of Rumanian background, realizes that the Communist government of Rumania is not a reflection of the will of the Rumanian people. We realize that the Rumanian people themselves have not changed in their love of liberty. We shall do everything prudently possible to hasten the day when all peoples have the opportunity to live in liberty and enjoy freedom.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the historic step taken by the gallant inhabitants of Rumania 88 years ago, during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78, constitutes a significant landmark in the turbulent history of the Rumanian people.

On May 10, 1877, the Rumanians proclaimed their independence from the Turks. In the ensuing war, they were victorious and the subsequent peace treaty guaranteed Rumania's freedom of independence. Thus, that daring act of May 10, 1877, marked the independence day of Rumania.

Since those distant days Rumanians have experienced the joy of freedom and the woes of foreign tyranny. Today they are grievously deprived of freedom in their homeland. Communist totalitarian dictatorship has eliminated all vestiges of independence there, but happily the Rumanian people have not given up their hope for eventual freedom.

Let us not forget the 10th of May when the Rumanian people demonstrated to the free and independent peoples of the world that centuries of oppression and suffering had not dimmed their hope for freedom, and their willingness to fight for their national independence. Though today once more they are robbed of their freedom, and are enslaved by Moscow-dominated forces in their homeland, I am confident that they will again regain their freedom and live happily in their beloved Rumania.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, although we Americans are among the most highly educated peoples in the world, for many of us the history of Eastern Europe is a huge blind spot. We seldom realize that the nations and peoples of Eastern Europe had to struggle long and valiantly before they attained independent status. Overrun by Turks or Russians in an earlier day, the peoples of Eastern Europe became pawns in the political power game as it was played by the Western nations, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire.

Throughout this long twilight period, the Rumanian people tenaciously held to their idea of nationhood. Their tenacity was rewarded when, at the end of the Crimean War, the powers recognized the autonomy of Wallachia and Moldavia, the Turkish provinces that were to make up the Rumanian state.

But the leaders of Rumania knew the temper of their people. They knew that both peasant and intellectual would not be satisfied short of outright independence. In the Russo-Turkish War of 1877 they saw their opportunity, and on May 10 of that year declared Rumanian independence to be an accomplished fact. Rumanian troops were skillfully employed to gain political advantage, be-

sides being of material help to the Russians. Rumania's independence was recognized by the powers in the Treaty of Berlin, a year later, but she was required to cede Bessarabia to Russia.

Today on another independence day, Rumania finds herself subjugated by a foreign power. That power, of course, is the Soviet Union, which installed communism by force and trickery in the closing stages of World War II. But Rumanians are showing that old spirit of independence that comforted them so much in their turbulent past. Rumania is eager to trade with, and learn from, the West, and it has shown a readiness to do so regardless of Soviet pressure. But surely this will not be enough. Surely Rumanian tenacity will triumph again, bringing with it true freedom so prized by all Rumanians. That is really the lesson of this Rumanian Independence Day.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues of the House, today, May 10, is the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. It commemorates the day when, in 1877, the people of Rumania declared their independence. During the following year that independence was recognized by the powers of Europe in the Treaty of Berlin. The culmination of Rumania's hopes and dreams, hopes and dreams sustained for hundreds of years, through a variety of historical regimes, was realized at last.

Yet Rumania, like so many of the states of southeastern Europe, was faced with massive internal problems, and was bedeviled, as were so many of her neighbors, by conflicting territorial claims, and bewildering ethnic heterogeneity. Despite these handicaps the country made notable economic and political progress in the period from 1878 to 1918. After the end of the first World War, in which Rumania participated on the side of the Allies, the country made spectacular economic progress. New industries, supported by domestic and foreign capital, sprouted extensively, and foreign trade expanded substantially. Political life flourished, parliamentary institutions grew stronger, and a number of Rumanian statesmen made a significant mark on the world scene, particularly M. Titulescu at the League of Nations. Rumanian foreign policy was pro-French in orientation; in fact Rumania was allied with France in one of the many pacts by which the latter sought to safeguard her security against a potentially renaissant Germany.

But with the onset of the depression and the rise of Nazi Germany, Rumania came under increasing pressure from antidemocratic forces, both within and without. Eventually these pressures proved too much for Rumania's democratic forces, and she lapsed into a royal dictatorship, which was followed by that of Fascist oriented elements. It was this government which took Rumania into the Second World War on the German side and which was overthrown by a popular uprising led by King Michael.

But the hopes which the popular young king aroused were soon to be dashed. The Soviet Union, having conquered the territory of Rumania in its advance against the Nazi legions, was determined

May 10, 1965

9648

to control the country together with the rest of Eastern Europe. Having rid themselves of one set of totalitarian masters, the Rumanians were to find that set replaced by another. With the establishment of the Rumanian Peoples Republic in 1947 all vestiges of a free society disappeared from Rumania.

But if history is relevant at all, and we believe that it is, the Communist regime which presently rules Rumania will disappear into the mists of time. Not today or tomorrow, let us have no illusions on that score. But eventually this will come to pass, for communism is alien to all Rumanian national traditions. In the long run, the institutions which nurture man's spirit survive, and those which demean it, perish. If we believe this truth, we can be certain that a day will come when Rumanians can celebrate their national independence on their native soil, and not in exile. In the meantime we salute the courage and tenacity of the Rumanian people, just as we salute these same qualities in the people of every country suffering under Communist tyranny.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. It is a date which commands the respect of all who cherish freedom and who hold steadfastly to its ideals regardless of cost.

The people of Tumania have a long and interesting history dating back to days of ancient Rome. From that time to the present they have maintained their distinctive cultural and linguistic qualities. But their political development, due to the facts of geography, has been tragically impaired by the insensitive forces of great power rivalry and greed.

This Christian nation was a constant object of Turkish aggression, and after many vallant struggles came under Ottoman domination in the 17th century. But this domination did not have even the saving grace of protection. Rumanian territory was caught up in the ambitions of three great neighboring empires—Russia, Turkey, and Austria. From the end of the 16th century until the day of independence in 1877, the Russian forces entered Rumanian territory at least 13 times, usually staying for periods of 5 or more years.

Most of the country remained under Turkish oppression, and at one point the Russians and Turks signed an agreement for joint control over the territory. This came after the wave of democratic nationalist revolutions that swept Europe in 1848 in which the Rumanians and many other oppressed nationalities attempted to win their freedom.

As Turkish power began to decline it was inevitably replaced by Russian hegemony. But the rise of Russian power in this area aroused the interest of England and France and, when Russia invaded Rumania, once again it led to the Crimean War and the defeat of Russia.

Some of the Rumanian territory was restored through the Treaty of Paris and a new government under Prince Alexander Cuza showed what the Rumanian people would do if given the chance to govern themselves. Serfdom was abol-

ished, the peasants received ownership of land, voting rights were broadened and compulsory education was instituted. A liberal constitution was established in 1866.

This newly won independence was threatened, however, when the Russians and Turks went to war in 1877. The Rumanian Government allowed Russian forces to enter its territory for the purpose of defense against the ancient oppressors, and Rumanian forces fought bravely along with those of Russia. But the Russians showed no gratitude and in a manner that has become familiar to us, they used the opportunity to demand and take parts of Bessarabia, with the compliance of other European powers.

In spite of this loss the Rumanian people were able after this episode to enjoy a period of freedom from outside oppression. Rumania fought with the Allies against the Germans in World War I. And again the Russians, before and after the Bolshevik revolution, attempted to use the situation to take Rumanian territory.

Between the two wars Rumania alined itself with the West, but when the Nazis and Communist Russians concluded their short-lived agreement to divide up the helpless peoples of Eastern Europe, Rumanian territory was once again taken by Russia. Rumania's independence could not survive the ensuing struggle and the Russians finally satisfied their greed by taking control of all of Rumania.

On this occasion of the anniversary of Rumania independence we desire to let the Rumanian people know that we have not forgotten them and do not consider their struggle for freedom to be at an end. Although, despite the strict confines of Soviet control today, we see that Rumania is attempting to move toward a degree of economic freedom that can only serve to loosen the bonds which some day must disappear. Recent years have seen Rumania forging ahead economically in a manner which augurs well for achievement of political as well as economic independence which will constitute an independence for Rumania on a May 10 not far removed from 1965.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to join in the commemoration of Rumanian Independence Day. Rumania achieved its independence on May 10, 1877, and retained its freedom until 1947, when King Michael was forced to abdicate by the Communists.

Rumanians in the free world who observe their enslaved nation's national holiday each year with great devotion are also diligently working in cooperation with representatives of other captive nations toward their common goal of restoring freedom to their native lands. It is a tragedy that the Rumanian people who suffer under Communist tyranny are prevented from celebrating their holiday, but their Soviet-imposed government seeks to obliterate all such traditional observances of Rumania's great past.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to observe the increased interest throughout the United States in the cause of the captive peoples of communism and the fact that

their legitimate aspirations for independence for their homelands constitutes a major weakness in the Soviet imperialist empire. Self-determination of peoples is a cornerstone of our foreign policy which must be maintained until all the nations enslaved by Communist tyranny achieve their independence.

The illegitimate Rumanian Government flaunts the will of the Rumanian people and is not a freely elected administration. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must do more than merely commemorate this and other national holidays of the captive nations. We must take positive action. An immediate step which the House of Representatives should take is to approve the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] establishing a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

USE OF FOOD AND FIBER PRODUCTS IN THE FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM AND DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, which would permit the Department of Agriculture to use food and fiber products produced by our American farmers, even if not in surplus, for title III of the food-for-peace program and for those domestic programs for which they supply commodities.

While my prime concern relates to the foreign activities and the vital use of this production in our foreign programs, the problem was most sharply called to my attention recently by a condition which developed in the domestic food programs. My bill covers both of these areas.

On the domestic scene, a situation, arose last winter in which butter was no longer considered a surplus commodity. As a result, the use of this dairy product in certain of the domestic programs was discontinued, and, I have been informed by the Department of Agriculture this past week, will not be resumed again until July 1.

To many of us familiar with dairy production patterns, this move by the Department of Agriculture to halt the use of butter, while perhaps technically correct as to interpretation of the law, made little sense when related to normal production activities. No one denied that within a few months, as the spring flush of milk production reached the markets, we would again see a surplus of butter accumulating. Yet, the Department of Agriculture was not in a position to continue the program, even with an anticipated surplus facing them. My bill would permit the continuation of programs under those circumstances.

In the food for peace program, we find an even greater challenge. The food for peace program has now completed a full decade. We have this experience to draw upon. The program has been refined through the years and there is basic ac-

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9653

ported in the Washington Daily News of April 28, are raising the property assessment 11 cents, a hefty increase in the citizens' tax burden. So, when interest rates go up, there is always a predictable burden on the average citizen in his annual tax bill. This will always result. The Prince Georges example may very well be multiplied 10,000-fold in every congressional district in all 50 States before the Fed's latest tight money campaign runs its course and triggers recession, a rise in unemployment and poverty, and requires more Government programs.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1965]

INTEREST RATE RISES ON COUNTY'S BONDS

Prince Georges County sold \$18.3 million worth of school and road bonds yesterday at an interest rate of 3.234 percent, a higher rate than on its last two yearly sales.

The interest rate, averaged over the 25-year life of the bonds, was also markedly higher than the 3.06 percent rate obtained by Montgomery County on \$10 million in bonds January 12.

The low bid was made by Chase Manhattan Bank & Associates, one of six bidders.

This year's interest rate is slightly higher than last year's 3.136. The county obtained its lowest rate, 3.019 percent, 2 years ago.

Bond Counselor Edward O. Clarke of the Baltimore firm of Smith, Somerville & Case, said Prince Georges was caught by "an unfortunate change in recent weeks."

"From what our bond counsel has told us," Acting Commission Chairman M. Bayne Brooke said, "the bond market has been off during the past month and compared with other comparable sales we did very well indeed."

Moody's Investors Service Bond Survey, which reports nationally on municipal bond sales, reported last month that after yesterday's sale, the per capita debt in Prince Georges would be \$299 and the total indebtedness would be 11.4 percent of the total assessed valuation.

"These ratios, while not low, are amply protected by the rising tax base," Moody's said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 28, 1965]

UP 11 CENTS PER \$100: PRINCE GEORGES HIKE TAX RATE

Prince Georges property taxes will go up 11 cents—to \$2.79 per \$100 assessment—in June to finance the \$95.4 million budget adopted yesterday by the county commissioners.

Original spending requests from department heads would have hiked taxes nearly 40 cents, but the commissioners trimmed away \$1.8 million and found nearly \$1.5 million in new revenue and savings. Last year's budget was \$81 million.

The continuing boom in the county, one of the fastest growing areas in the Nation, hiked property values from \$1.316 to \$1.551 billion last year, adding more than \$3 billion in tax receipts.

In their 6-week study of the budget, the commissioners cut \$1.1 million from school requests; \$250,000 from police spending (despite adding the 46 officers); \$150,000 from roads; and \$80,000 from the county hospital subsidy.

Actions by this year's legislature will give the treasury an extra \$1 million from a property sales levy increase, and \$390,000 in additional State education aid. A new insurance program will save \$36,000 on premium payments.

Takoma Park will pay a \$2.77 property rate, reflecting a 2-cent allowance for the city's own library system.

ROLLCALL NO. 99

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall No. 99, the Health Research Facilities Act. I was on my way back to Washington from New York City where this morning I was chairing hearings of the General Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor on H. R. 7177 and related bills to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Control Act of 1961.

Had I been present for rollcall No. 99, I would have voted "aye."

THE PROBLEM OF SILVER AND COINAGE

(Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent months about the problem of silver and the coinage. Much has been said in this body, and much has been said in the Nation's press.

For many months the Treasury Department has been conducting a study, and it is sincerely hoped by all concerned that the Department's recommendations will be sent to the Congress as soon as possible.

We have heard a great deal of talk about how our silver stocks are dwindling, and the Treasury has been warned that if a change is not made soon in the silver content of our coins, we will run out of silver in a few years. Some have gone so far as to recommend that all silver be removed from our coins so that Treasury stocks and new production would be available for industrial uses. Some have even gone so far as to maintain that silver is too precious a metal to be used in our Nation's coins. Yet these same people do not find silver too precious to be used in knives and forks, although such use can hardly be called a critical national defense need.

When listening to these arguments, I suggest that my colleagues ask themselves the question, "What is the most important use of silver?" Certainly we need silver in the manufacture of photographic materials, in solders and brazing alloys and in electrical and electronic products. In 1963 space and defense applications consumed at least 8.5 million ounces. The use of silver in the fabrication of sterling and plated ware is an important application, although no one would seriously regard it as the most important use of this precious metal.

I firmly believe—and I am convinced that this belief is shared by millions of Americans—that one of the most important uses of our silver, if not the most important, is its use in our coins. The fact that the American citizen knows that his dime, his quarter and his half dollar contain silver gives him confidence in these coins and confidence in our entire monetary system. Some jeer at this,

pointing out that there is as much confidence in a \$10 bill as there is in a dime, which by virtue of its silver content has intrinsic value. Some say there is no logic to this belief; some call it emotionalism or old fashioned. Perhaps, but the attitude of the American citizen toward his money is of vital importance in today's economic world as it has been throughout the history of our Republic.

Many of my distinguished colleagues from the West have expressed this view far better than I, and what has been the answer? Some have said that the feeling for sound money, the love of silver money, is a vestige of the past and is only reflected by the people in the West where much of our silver is mined today. There is no doubt that we in the West have been more outspoken on this subject, but I do not believe our citizens in other parts of the country would support the complete removal of silver from our coins. I have had collected for me some editorials from newspapers published in some of our non-Western States, which substantiate this view. Some of these papers are large and some are small.

Here is a quote from an editorial in the Lakeland, Fla., Ledger of March 4, 1965:

The Ledger suggests that U.S. mints be operated to serve the public at large, and not cater to the special interests of a relatively few persons. We submit that these two reforms alone—elimination of the mint mark and of the date from the design of coins—would go a long way toward solving the coin shortage. Perhaps enough, even, to permit the continued use of unadulterated silver. We believe that a sudden change to some base metal or plastic in our dimes, quarters, and half-dollars would have a bad psychological effect on the public respect for all U.S. currency.

An editorial from the Atlanta, Ga., Times of March 28, 1965:

With the continuing devaluation of the American dollar through inflation, and the ever-upward spiral of wages and prices, it is a questionable action to remove silver from our coins.

Here is a quote from the Greenfield, Ind., Reporter of January 30, 1965:

The feel, the sound, the sense of value and security in our present coinage are important roots of our American stability. Real silver money will help us retain our self-respect both at home and abroad.

From the Baton Rouge, La., Advocate of February 4, 1965:

The public has been accustomed to the idea of some coins, nickels and pennies, being made of different kinds of metals.

Coins of a different metal would buy as much or as little as they now buy. But the appearance of the coins, and ultimately the psychology of their users, still must be considered. These considerations favor an eventual reduction of the amount of silver in small coins rather than elimination of its use.

Here is what the Niles, Mich., Star said on March 22, 1965:

If the coinage is to be stripped of its silver, then Washington may be assaulting the faith of the American people to continue to believe in the progress of this economic system.

One of the most significant editorials that has crossed my desk is from the

9654

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 10, 1965

April 5, 1965, Watertown Times, of Watertown, N.Y. It is entitled, "Keep Silver in Coins," and I would like to present it to you in its entirety:

Disturbing the present composition of silver coins, which has existed since 1792, is considered dangerous, despite a necessity to relieve the shortage, one which becomes more serious year after year. So far no corrective measures have been undertaken. Suggestions have been made that the composition of the coins be drastically changed so that there will be less silver used.

Simon D. Strauss, vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., had some interesting remarks to make in a speech before the New York Society of Security Analysts. He is emphatically opposed to abandonment of silver coins in favor of some other metal that is less scarce.

Mr. Strauss warns: "The lesson of history is that when currency of intrinsic value disappears completely from the monetary system, in due course the currency of that nation loses substantially all of its value. This was true as far back as the ancient Greek city-states and the Roman Empire; it was true of Germany, Japan, and Italy as recently as World War II."

Mr. Strauss pointed out that the United States has inherited a coinage that has survived unchanged since 1792, adding: "In that year when Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, asked Congress to authorize the minting of coins containing 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper, he hit upon a composition that has met all the tests of a satisfactory coinage. Silver coins are attractive, durable, hard to counterfeit, and meet the psychological need of the public for a coinage of real value that carries the ring of authenticity."

The Government needs to find other means to relieve the silver shortage than to reduce or eliminate entirely the amount used in the composition of the silver coins. There is little question that once the public is told of plans to distribute new coins without silver, hoarding of the silver coins will move at a much faster pace and eventually none will be found in circulation.

Disturbing the present composition of the silver coins is dangerous, and any idea of making a drastic change should be abandoned. Other avenues must exist to find a way out to relieve the shortage. Eventually, the Government will unearth a plan but in the meantime it must realize that the risk is too great to tamper seriously with the present composition of our silver coins.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need to remove silver entirely from our coinage. Certainly the silver content must be reduced, but it is vital that some silver be retained in our coinage. By reducing the silver content to one-third, the Treasury's silver reserve for coins would be approximately tripled. There are some 1.9 billion ounces of silver currently outstanding in coins. Many of these coins will be recovered over the years ahead, and this silver can be used for new lower content coins. The producers of silver have announced new production increases within the next 4 years which would increase free world silver production by 18 percent.

This new production along with present Treasury reserves and silver obtained from melting present coins will provide a long-term supply of silver for our Nation's coin needs as well as the needs for industry and the arts.

A BILL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF WATER SYSTEMS IN RURAL AREAS

(Mr. BANDSTRA (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would establish, under the Farmers Home Administration, a program for Federal grants to aid in the development of water systems in rural areas.

An adequate water supply is one of the greatest needs of rural America. A small community in a rural area may possess good sites for industrial development, good transportation, good communications, and good government.

However, if it lacks an adequate and dependable water supply, the community cannot hope to keep up with the economic growth taking place in so many parts of the Nation.

Past experience has shown that the Federal Government can play an important and constructive role in promoting rural development. The Rural Electrification Administration, for example, has demonstrated that it is possible to bring the power resources of an industrialized society to rural areas.

The purpose of this bill is to make sure that small towns and farming areas have the opportunity to make the most of their water resources and to share in America's economic growth.

The bill would amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended in 1962 by Public Law 87-703 and Public Law 87-798.

The bill, first of all, provides for the authorization of Federal grants totaling up to \$25 million in any fiscal year to help finance projects in rural areas for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water.

These grants would be available to public or quasi-public agencies and non-profit corporations for development of water systems in areas where there is a community of less than 5,000 population.

Secondly, the bill would authorize Federal grants of up to \$5 million in any fiscal year for comprehensive planning in the development of rural water systems.

A similar bill, S. 1766, has been introduced in the Senate and has gained strong support there. I am hopeful that my fellow Members in the House of Representatives will recognize the need for this legislation.

(Mr. OTTINGER (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. OTTINGER'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICY ON VIETNAM IS A POLICY FOR PEACE

(Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted per-

mission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the great Philadelphia newspaper, the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 29, 1965, deals with one of the most important problems facing the country today and calls to the attention of the people of America that President Johnson's policy in Vietnam is a policy to bring about world peace and should be supported by all peace-loving, freedom-loving nations.

The editorial is as follows:

IN QUEST OF NEGOTIATION

It is easy enough for the critics of President Johnson to talk, in the abstract, about negotiating a peaceful settlement in Vietnam.

The President, however, cannot deal in abstracts. He must work with realities. He cannot simply ignore the obstacles to peace. He must overcome them.

He is confronted with the extremely difficult problems of how to get meaningful negotiations started and how to achieve a bona fide peace that will be something more than merely a camouflaged surrender to Communist conquest.

In his forthright opening statement at Tuesday's news conference, and in subsequent answers to questions, President Johnson came to grips with these problems.

With timely and appropriate reference to the appeasement of Hitler at Munich in 1938, which prepared the battleground for the Second World War, Mr. Johnson applied the lesson to Vietnam. "To yield to aggression," he said "brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of a lasting peace."

The U.S. strategy in Vietnam, fundamentally, is to bring about a peaceful settlement, within the framework of freedom, by convincing the Communist North Vietnamese that there will be no cheap and easy victory—or, in fact, any victory at all—by force of arms.

President Johnson continues to take the initiative in opening the door to negotiation. "I say again that I will talk to any government, any where, any time, without any conditions, and if any doubt our sincerity, let them test us."

It is hard to imagine how the door could be opened any wider.

We hope the chronic critics of administration policy laid down their signs of protest long enough to hear the President's words. It would be a refreshing change of pace if so-called proponents of peace would get behind the President in his quest for a peaceful solution.

Cooperation from allies would be helpful, too. Charles de Gaulle's latest outburst of caustic comment, denouncing U.S. efforts to stem the tide of Communist aggression in southeast Asia, is a vicious kind of sniping that hurts the chances for peace.

An international conference may be taking shape in Cambodia—a parley that could lead to negotiations on Vietnam. The U.S. State Department has served public notice of this country's willingness to participate. President Johnson's renewed bid for negotiations is well timed and could produce affirmative response.

THE COLD WAR AND THE "R" FACTORS

(Mr. ZABLOCKI (at the request of Mr. LOVE) was granted permission to ex-

May 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2259

negotiation can best be achieved by the methods and plans that he has laid.

Had the President never stated that he was pursuing a course which he personally believed would permit the earliest possible convening of negotiations, I would have no choice but to vote against his actions thus far. But in the context of his avowed purposes, I believed that he was entitled to pursue his course with the support of the people of the State of Hawaii, as cast by my vote as one of its representatives.

Further the President has stated to the Congress that without its overwhelming vote of confidence, his actions are subject to the interpretation by the Government of North Vietnam as not having the full support of the American people. He has explained that his hand would be weakened in his efforts to bring the parties to the conference table. His case is irrefutable. Any leader without the support of his people cannot display the resolution and conviction that this kind of crisis demands.

And so, though I am first and foremost committed to the cause of peace, I cast my vote in support of the President; that I do in fact believe his intent to seek a negotiated peace in Vietnam. As an elected representative of the people of Hawaii I could not let my feelings as an individual outweigh my responsibilities at this point, and so I had to say to the President that we of Hawaii do have confidence in his integrity and sincerity to achieve the ends of peace by means of negotiations.

The President said to the Congress in his May 4 message:

For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

This was the basis of my vote of confidence.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of Senators to a significant article recently published in the Minneapolis Tribune. Miss Sylvia Porter pointed up one of today's most important facts: that food, whether the most costly or the least expensive brand, is today far and away the greatest single bargain in America.

I commend Miss Porter's report to Senators as another verification of the benefits which American agriculture has brought to all of us. All Americans benefit when American agriculture is producing abundantly and efficiently.

Therefore, I request unanimous consent that Miss Porter's article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, Apr. 13, 1965]

FOOD FOR THOUGHT ON GROCERY PRICES

(By Sylvia Porter)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—How much money could you save on your food budget if you ignored quality and convenience and traded down instead of trading up? To answer this question, I went through a typical supermarket last week with one shopping list and two carts. Into the "bargain" cart I put the least expensive brand of each of 25 items, and into the "splurge" cart I put the most costly brands.

Price alone dictated my selections, but none of the items was an advertised special. When I checked out my two carts, I found my bargain basket cost \$20.01 and my splurge basket came to \$36.74—a difference of \$16.73, or 84 percent.

Here's my grocery list, with the high and low prices:

Item	High	Low
Frankfurters (2 pounds).....	\$1.00	\$1.15
Hamburger (3 pounds).....	2.97	1.47
Liver (2 pounds).....	1.98	.78
Bacon (2 pounds).....	1.80	1.14
Steak (3 pounds).....	4.47	2.07
Eggs (2 dozen).....	.99	.74
Butter (2 pounds).....	1.62	1.38
Milk (8 quarts).....	2.16	1.03
Coffee (3 pounds).....	2.79	2.13
White bread (2 loaves).....	.69	.37
Frozen orange juice (4 6-ounce cans).....	1.10	.79
Frozen peas (6 packages).....	1.86	.95
Pears (2 large cans).....	.69	.66
Mayonnaise (large jar).....	.69	.43
Vegetable soup (4 cans).....	.98	.27
Cat food (3 cans).....	.70	.29
Tomatoes (2 large cans).....	.70	.49
Salad oil (1 quart).....	1.15	.59
Beer (6-pack).....	2.70	.83
Cookies (1 box).....	.40	.29
Onions (3 pounds).....	.60	.25
Spaghetti (2 boxes).....	.50	.43
Potatoes (10 pounds).....	1.75	.94
Liquid detergent (1 quart).....	.87	.49
Flour (5 pounds).....	.63	.45

¹ Powdered.

Food prices have been rising from year to year but at a much slower pace than our personal incomes and our overall living costs. Personal incomes have soared 145 percent since 1949, but food prices have climbed only 15 percent—and today food takes an all-time low of 18.5 percent of our take-home pay.

Admittedly, most of us don't want to shop strictly for bargains. We want quality and convenience, we're willing to pay the price.

But, as my supermarket experiment and the national figures on food price trends underline, food is one of the greatest single bargains in the United States today—any way you count it.

Fifth District Voters Support President's
Position in VietnamEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, each year during the past 5 years I have conducted a poll of public opinion in the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut, which I have the honor to represent. I have just completed a tabulation of the returns on my most recent questionnaire which covers 14 major issues

confronting the Congress and the administration and never before has the questionnaire turned up a more significant registration of public opinion than the current one. It is particularly noteworthy because of the nature of the response to the questions concerning Vietnam.

I include in the RECORD the complete chart of the results of my questionnaire, but I want to call particular attention to some of the highlights. On the issue of Vietnam, 38.8 percent or a plurality of those answering favored intervention in strength by U.S. forces, 36.4 percent opposed such action, 24.8 percent expressed no opinion. The answers become more significant and I am sure that the President will take comfort in the knowledge that 68.6 percent flatly opposed withdrawal of U.S. support from South Vietnam and 62.6 percent favored expansion of our present support program for the people and army of South Vietnam.

While this study is the fifth which I have conducted, it is the first report of sentiment from the redistricted Fifth Congressional District, the boundaries of which became effective with the convening of the 89th Congress.

I am happy to tell you that my constituents are continuing to demonstrate a gratifying interest in the problems of government. In response to approximately 20,000 questionnaire cards distributed by me, at no cost to the Government, I received a total of 3,300 returns or 16.5 percent and these were mailed to me by my constituents at their own expense. In addition, I received hundreds of letter from constituents who commented at length on the issues listed, having found unduly restrictive the confinement to the "yes" or "no" of the printed questionnaire.

I am grateful to the people of my district who have assisted me by their participation in this survey. While I do not look upon these returns as an official mandate, they are helpful guides and indicators of public opinion trends. I shall, of course, continue to exercise my own judgment in voting on the issues.

I want to point out the heavy registration of support for revision and improvement of presidential and vice-presidential succession and inability laws and for a 60-day limit on presidential campaigns, which have been two of the subjects in which I have taken a very personal and particular interest. Among other subjects in which I have initiated legislative action and which have won strong support in the survey are an accelerated program of Federal assistance for local-State effort to curb water and air pollution; a constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools; Federal legislation to guarantee the right of voting registration for every citizen; and an additional income tax exemption for persons paying expenses of college students. There are others, but these are the ones most favored.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the complete tabulation of the 14 sections and the several subsections covered in my 1965 questionnaire, showing the total scores both in figures and in percentages:

A2260

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 10, 1965

Results of questionnaire, April 1965, JOHN S. MOWAGAN, 5th District of Connecticut

	Yes		No		Undecided	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Do you favor?						
1. (a) A program of hospital and nursing care under social security?	2,019	61.2	1,145	34.7	136	4.1
(b) Extension of present programs based on general tax revenue?	1,591	48.2	736	22.3	973	29.5
2. (c) Withdrawal of U.S. support from South Vietnam	610	18.6	2,263	68.6	427	12.9
(d) Expansion of our present support program for the people and Army of South Vietnam?	2,026	62.6	719	21.8	515	15.6
(e) Intervention in strength by U.S. forces?	1,281	38.8	1,201	36.4	818	24.8
3. Repeal of sec. 14-(b) of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947?	702	21.3	921	27.9	1,677	50.8
4. Revision of immigration and nationality laws by elimination of the national quota system?	1,609	51.2	1,187	36.0	423	12.8
5. Inclusion of private and parochial schools in benefits of Federal programs of aid to education	1,851	56.1	1,317	39.9	132	4.0
6. Abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee	745	22.6	2,052	62.2	403	15.2
7. A 60-day limit on presidential campaigns?	2,811	85.2	357	10.8	132	4.0
8. A constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary recitation of prayer in public schools?	2,683	81.3	426	13.2	181	5.5
9. (a) Appropriations for U.S. foreign aid program (military)?	1,728	52.3	1,141	34.8	433	13.1
(b) Appropriations for U.S. foreign aid program (economic)?	1,956	59.3	944	28.6	406	12.1
10. Additional income tax exemption for persons paying expenses of college students?	2,547	77.2	604	18.3	149	4.5
11. Accelerated program of Federal assistance for local-State effort to curb water and air pollution?	2,799	84.8	323	9.8	178	5.4
12. Revision and improvement of presidential and vice-presidential succession and inability laws?	3,010	91.2	101	3.1	189	5.7
13. Termination of selective service (draft)?	759	23.0	2,211	67.0	230	10.0
14. Federal legislation to guarantee the right of voting registration for every citizen?	2,908	88.1	280	7.6	142	4.3

Statement by Senator Smathers and Address by Vice President Humphrey at Annual Meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks entitled "Inspiration of the Handicapped" and those made by the Vice President of the United States, on April 30, at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

There being no objection, the statement and the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSPIRATION OF THE HANDICAPPED—STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

It is an inspiration to us all when we see men rise above crippling handicaps and go on to render significant contributions to society.

Such men inspire not only those of us who are more fortunate but more importantly, those who have been disabled and who must make major readjustments to life.

Roger W. Irving, of St. Petersburg, Fla., is that kind of a man.

On April 29, Mr. Irving was honored as the Handicapped American of the Year and received from Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz a special plaque.

At 72, Roger W. Irving is continuing to lead an active and useful life despite multiple handicaps including the loss of an arm, the removal of his larynx because of cancer, and a recent sight impairment.

Despite this, Mr. Irving has rendered outstanding service to his fellow Americans—ranging from the Boy Scouts to laryngectomies like himself, to whom he has taught the technique of regaining speech.

I regret that other duties prevented me from being present at ceremonies honoring Mr. Irving on April 29.

Mr. Irving demonstrates so graphically that a physical handicap need not be the end of a career. He is a credit to the State of Florida and the entire Nation.

Vice President HUMPHREY has summed up, I think, some excellent thoughts on the contributions of men like Roger W. Irving and the role of the handicapped in society.

The Vice President's remarks were prepared to delivery April 30 at the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL 30, 1965

Four years ago, Emik Avakian won the President's trophy as Handicapped Man of the Year. Mr. Avakian is severely cerebral palsied, almost unable to sit in a wheelchair.

Years ago, he had to fight his way into college against the advice of counselors who thought he was too severely handicapped. Now an electrical engineer, he is also a brilliant scientist. He devised a lightning-fast reservation system whereby airlines can tell how many seats are available on all flights.

He couldn't hold a pencil, so he invented a typewriter that could be operated with his breath. He is at present working on use of a computer to control radiation beams that might perform bloodless surgery on that part of the brain which, if injured, can cause cerebral palsy.

This disabled American acts to overcome not only his own disability but to make possible new vistas for the able as well as for the disabled. Others are joined in this struggle. This administration is committed to it. And so are you.

This February, President Johnson wrote to the Nation's employers:

"Given encouragement and hope, our handicapped citizens can competitively earn a useful place in our great land of opportunity. They have the courage. All they need is a chance to prove themselves."

It is you who are providing that chance—you of Governors' committees and mayors' committees, you who are leaders of business, of labor, civic groups, veterans, and other voluntary organizations.

Your teamwork with the President's committees, the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and State rehabilitation agencies has opened employment doors which for too long were barred to the handicapped. You opened those closed doors by first opening closed minds. Those minds had arbitrarily rejected the disabled as being allegedly "unemployable." But "open minds," "open hearts," friendly outstretched hands have changed that picture.

Thus, as an example, last year, 8,300 men and women who had been regarded as completely outside the labor force—because they were mentally retarded—were put to gainful

work. They represent only a small portion of the 3 million retarded who are capable of doing a job. But this important beginning does show what can be done.

I honor those—in the National Association for Retarded Children—and in cooperating organizations who blazed this path of progress.

This October will mark the 20th anniversary of the first celebration of a special week to employ the handicapped.

Eighteen years ago it was my privilege, as mayor of Minneapolis, to issue one of the first municipal proclamations for observance of that week. At that time, the secretary of our mayor's committee was a young Purple Heart veteran named Orville Freeman. Today, as Secretary of Agriculture, he is leading the fight to aid America's rural disabled.

In this auditorium today are many pioneers of jobs-for-the-handicapped. You have proven that it is definitely good business to employ the handicapped.

And it is good government and good citizenship to get a disabled man off the welfare roll onto a payroll and a tax roll.

For years, the roll call of honor for the handicapped was headed by the predecessor of your great Harold Russell a fellow Minnesotan, the late Gen. Melvin Maas. Though blind, General Maas "saw" this need of the Nation and responded magnificently to it.

He led us closer to the time when all men and women in our society will have opportunity to develop their talents and skills.

The goal of this administration is—as it was General Maas' goal—opportunity for all Americans. We seek opportunity for all who would work to lift themselves.

The handicapped do want to work. The handicapped do not want pity. They do not want handouts. And they do not want "made work." They ask only that they be trained for meaningful jobs they can perform and that, whenever necessary, jobs be adapted so they can perform them.

That is not too much to ask.

But the job-seeking handicapped comprise a long waiting list. Three million Americans have disabilities which still keep them on the fringes of community and family life.

Year by year, the numbers of the rehabilitated are—fortunately—rising. In 5 years, we hope to reach the annual mark of rehabilitating 200,000 each year.

But the time gap implicit in these figures confirms how far we still have to go.

Meanwhile time hangs heavy on those waiting their chance for a job. Is there anyone among us who can calculate the anguish of the man or woman forced to wait or who vainly apply for employment—time after time—only to be rejected?

For these men and women we are determined to open up more jobs. Jobs are

the needs of his many patients in Wilkes and surrounding counties. Because of Dr. Stephens' outstanding record in the past and because of the fact that he is still active and enjoying attending to a large clientele in general practice, we deem it a privilege to nominate him for General Practitioner of the Year in the State of Georgia."

Israel Independence

SPEECH
OF

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1965

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to join the commemoration of the independence of Israel. For the past 17 years Israel has been an example to all the nations of the world of what a determined people can do under a free, democratic government. Not only has Israel progressed notably at home, but she has also supported the United States and the United Nations and has undertaken a successful technical assistance program to emerging nations of Africa and Asia.

Israel was called "a land flowing with milk and honey" in the Bible—Deuteronomy 6: 3. Yet in 1948 much of Israel was an arid desert. Furthermore, the tiny nation was surrounded with enemies and was faced with a flood of refugees which, proportionately, was many times greater than the number of refugees that the United States admitted in the first two decades of this century. Industrial development lagged, and manufacturing techniques were not widely known.

Yet in 17 years Israel has gone a long way toward fulfilling the Biblical pronouncement. The new state has struggled against an unfavorable balance of trade and has scored notable achievements in this area. The gross national product has grown considerably and new industry is flourishing.

In the Israel Proclamation of Independence may be found the ideals of the Jewish people. I would like to quote two paragraphs which seem to me to be particularly important in the year 1965:

Despite every hardship, hindrance and peril, the remnant that survived the grim Nazi slaughter in Europe, together with Jews from other countries, pressed on with their exodus to the land of Israel and continued to assert their right to a life of dignity, freedom and honest toil in the homeland of their people.

We extend the hand of peace and good-neighborliness to all the states around us and to their peoples, and we call upon them to cooperate in mutual helpfulness with the independent Jewish nation in its land. The State of Israel is prepared to make its contribution in a concerted effort for the advancement of the entire Middle East.

These words need to be remembered today for they contain the foundation for the program that can be the salvation of the Middle East. Israel has lived up to the ideals that it put in writing back in 1948. May these ideals become realities in the very near future, and may Israel be free to develop in

peace. Her past accomplishments give every reason to hope that the Israeli future will be a proud one.

Our Canyon Will Not Be Flooded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, many friends of conservation in this Congress have been receiving mail from persons expressing fear that the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River is about to be despoiled. Their fears stem from provisions of a bill introduced in duplicate by a majority of Members from both Arizona and California, following the recent settlement of longstanding differences between the two States over division of water from the Colorado.

The chief concern of our critics results from the plan to erect two new dams along the lower Colorado, to generate electric power that would help eventually to pay the cost of the central Arizona project. It is charged that the backup of water from these dams would destroy for all time the scenic splendor of the Grand Canyon, one of the great wonders of America.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I have been deeply disturbed by the criticism it aroused on this score. Thus I felt relieved last week upon reading a newspaper column by Jones Osborn, publisher of the daily Yuma, Ariz., Sun. Mr. Osborn, an Arizonan since childhood, is no newcomer to the great Southwest nor to the cause of conservation, which his newspaper stoutly defends. He has traversed much of the lower Colorado by boat and afoot. I can imagine no one whose blood would boil faster if the Grand Canyon were in fact facing destruction.

It should be noted that Yuma County, the area served by Mr. Osborn's newspaper, would not benefit directly from the central Arizona project, which aims to irrigate another section of the State. But this publisher's concern for facts prompted him to dissect what he thought to be a misleading account of the Grand Canyon's peril, as carried by the Christian Science Monitor.

Not as a final judgment, Mr. Speaker, but as information that may assist other Members in answering their mail on this subject, I offer for the RECORD the "Editor's Notebook" column by Jones Osborn, from the Yuma Sun for Friday, May 7.

OUR CANYON WILL NOT BE FLOODED

(By Jones Osborn)

"Danger: Tricky words ahead."

Some news reports and newspaper and magazine columns should carry that warning to readers. Because it does not take much to turn a straight and fair news report into a misleading article. Most publications try very hard to be fair and one of the best of these is the Christian Science Monitor.

But the Monitor slipped yesterday. It

caught my eye because it was about Arizona.

On its front page, the Monitor said:

"Plans to dam up both ends of the Grand Canyon may yet detonate a major storm in the American West."

(Notice the use of four words: "dam up both ends." This creates an image of the Grand Canyon being plugged up at both ends and filled with water like a giant bathtub. This image will be reinforced in a later paragraph.)

More from the Monitor:

"The Federal Government wants to build two electric power dams on the Colorado River, which snakes through the canyon. They would belong to the central Arizona project, a \$1.3 billion scheme to water Arizona's dry heartland."

(The tricky word is "scheme." It has the sound of something not quite honest, like a scheme to defraud the public.)

"The lower dam would form a new lake, backing up deep into the Grand Canyon itself."

(Thus, the final touch is added to the image of a grand canyon being plugged at both ends and then filled with water.)

What is the truth of the matter?

The truth, while similar, is substantially different.

It is true that the central Arizona project calls for two power dams on the Colorado River to earn money to help pay costs.

The lower dam, in Bridge Canyon, would indeed form a lake. This lake would be 93 miles long.

But the first 53 miles of this lake would be located in Lake Meade National Recreation Area.

The next 40 miles would be found in the Grand Canyon National Monument—but only 13 of these would actually be found in the Grand Canyon itself.

For the remaining 104 miles of the Grand Canyon (all the way to the upstream dam) the river would be unchanged. It would continue to be "white water," as the engineers say, rapid flow of the mainstream.

Incidentally, none of the newly formed lake would even be visible from any of the viewing points where millions of tourists now view the grandeurs of this great natural wonder.

Times Herald-Record of Middletown, N.Y., Wins Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to report that the Middletown Times Herald-Record in my congressional district—27, New York—has won first honorable mention among tabloid newspapers in the annual Ayer competition for excellence of typography, makeup and printing.

For the past 35 years the N. W. Ayer Award has been coveted by English-language daily newspapers published in this country, to whom the contest is open. This year's entries numbered 700.

As the top prize—the Ayer Cup—went to a regular-size newspaper, the award to the Middletown Times Herald-Record places it first among tabloids.

I wish to take this opportunity to publicly applaud its most talented management and staff for their very fine achievement.

May 10, 1965

The Larger Implications of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in two recent articles, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, James Reston, has added several thoughtful and pertinent observations to the debate on Vietnam.

In suggesting that now may be a time to give private diplomacy a chance, Mr. Reston has pointed out that Washington's options are limited:

Regardless of the mistakes and miscalculations of the past, it is not engaged in a discussion of what might have been, but in how to avoid a defeat that would have the most serious consequences in Asia and the Middle East.

He has gone on to comment that:

The Communists have seen to it in Vietnam—and they will no doubt do so elsewhere—that we are confronted with highly ambiguous situations, where the arguments are not clear but vague, and any course of action or even inaction may be risky.

Mr. Speaker, neither of these articles presents a solution to a country and a world sorely troubled by war, but each makes a contribution to any meaningful and constructive debate:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 23, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE LARGER IMPLICATIONS OF VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The war in Vietnam has shown once more that the United States still does not have a satisfactory answer to the problem of limited war.

Washington has an effective strategy for deterring nuclear war, which will probably not start, but not for limited wars, which never seem to cease. And the disturbing thing about Vietnam is that all the other border lands along the Chinese-Soviet periphery from Korea to Iran are vulnerable in one degree or another to the Communist techniques of subversion and indirect aggression.

Vietnam, therefore, is not only a present agony but a warning of future trouble in other areas. One does not have to believe in the domino theory—that if Vietnam falls many other states will follow—in order to recognize the dangers inherent in the triumph of what the Communists call—as in Vietnam—wars of national liberation.

THE UNCHANGED OBJECTIVES

The Communist objectives have not changed. They are determined to extend their influence and control as far as they can. What the Soviets attempted by political pressure on Western Europe, by threats of war over Berlin, by nuclear blackmail in Cuba and by their adventure in Korea, the Chinese Communists are now trying to achieve by subversion and guerrilla warfare in Vietnam.

The Soviet Government has come to realize the dangers of this process, at least in areas far from their frontiers, but the Chinese have not. There are serious indications that Moscow wants a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, whatever it says publicly, but Peking has another idea. It thinks it can triumph by limited war in Vietnam, and

if it does, the problem of countering limited wars from the Sea of Japan to the Persian Gulf will be even more serious than it is today.

AGGRESSION BY SUBVERSION

How, then, is this aggression by subversion to be stopped? This is the main point. There is no evidence that anything but power will deter the Communists from seeking their objectives. They are the arsenal of rebellion. Therefore, despite all the argument about diplomatic and military tactics in Vietnam, this larger question of how to wage limited wars against their advance remains.

Several theories have been advanced about this. The first is that it is impossible in politically unstable areas right up against China or the Soviet Union for the United States to do anything about it. A variation of this doctrine is that it may be possible to do something about this type of war but only at a cost the American people will not pay.

The second theory, popular during the Dulles-Radford ascendancy in the Eisenhower administration, is that this kind of frustrating war must be avoided by other means. The Secretary of the Air Force in those days of brave words and small budgets, Donald A. Quarles, explained this theory as follows:

"If it were obvious that limited aggressions would be met with the full force of atomic weapons, I do not believe such aggressions would occur."

However, when it came time to practice this doctrine, Eisenhower concluded that maybe it wasn't such a good idea.

A third theory is that America can engage in these wars effectively only if it retreats off the continent of Asia and draws the line against Communist aggression farther south where it has blue sky and blue water to exercise its superior air and naval power.

Finally, the fourth theory is what is being applied by the Johnson administration now. This is that it can hold the populous areas of South Vietnam with its own troops if necessary and meanwhile use its air and naval power to demonstrate that a continuation of the aggression in South Vietnam will cost the Communists in North Vietnam more than they will gain in the South.

THE PRESIDENT'S CRITICS

It is now popular among the administration's critics to say that this policy has failed, that the Communists are not impressed by the bombings, and this may or may not be right. What we do know is that in the last few days there have been private messages to the West indicating that Moscow, if not Peking, feels that the conflict must now either go to the conference table with the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong or go forward into a much more serious war including Soviet and Chinese weapons and "volunteers."

This, therefore, may be a time to give private diplomacy a chance. The U.S. Government, whether right or wrong, is engaged in a delicate operation. Regardless of the mistakes and miscalculations of the past, it is not engaged in a discussion of what might have been, but in how to avoid a defeat that would have the most serious consequences in Asia and the Middle East.

Washington is not now free to adopt any policy advice. It is not free to avoid the consequences of its past commitments or even of its blunders. Its options are limited.

LIMITS ON ACTION

It is not morally free, for example, to carry the air war into the populous areas of North Vietnam where the really important strategic targets are located. Nor is it morally free to abandon the people who have committed themselves to the battle in South Vietnam and who will be at the mercy of the Vietcong if we pull out.

Even more important, it is not free to submit to the triumph of the Communist guerrilla techniques without making them pay dearly in the process, for if they succeed in Vietnam, nobody dare assume in Washington that the same techniques will not be applied in all the Communist rimlands from Korea to Iran.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 2, 1965]

ANN ARBOR: THE STRANGE BEDFELLOWS IN VIETNAM

(By James Reston)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—Vietnam has produced some odd divisions of opinion in the country. President Johnson has strong support from Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, but not the same from Senators MANSFIELD and FULLBRIGHT. Walter Lippmann, who usually supports the President, is now opposing him on Vietnam, and David Lawrence, who usually opposes him, is backing him up.

Meanwhile, liberal sentiment on the university campuses is critical of Mr. Johnson's Vietnam policy, while the conservative intellectuals, who not so long ago were condemning Mr. Johnson, are now either silent or mocking him for following the Vietnam policy of Barry Goldwater.

COMPLEX BATTLELINE

This has now reached the point, moreover, where the prominent spokesmen of both sides are now fighting with one another, with Dean Rusk, the Phi Beta Kappa and Rhodes scholar, condemning the opposition teachers and students; Joe Alsop calling Hans Morgenthau an appeaser, and Morgenthau describing Alsop's proadministration line a scandal.

It is impossible to deal with all the complex issues in the debate in a column, but it may be useful to say something about the debate itself—particularly the issue between the administration and its critics in the universities.

First, it is obvious that all the major problems in the field of foreign policy are now increasingly complex and subject to honest differences of opinion. Therefore, every course of action is open to debate, and any course of action can be condemned.

This is not only true of the bombings in Vietnam or the ending of the bombings, but it is true of the decision to land the Marines in Santo Domingo without prior consultation with the Organization of American States.

Second, since all courses of action are debatable, the need for discussion and debate is unarguable, especially since the administration's misjudgments of the political and military situation in Vietnam are conceded by responsible Government officials themselves.

Third, the principal obligation of responsible debate at the moment is how to deal with the problem now before the country. The opposition will properly debate in the next election how we got into the mess, but the problem for now and the foreseeable future is how to get out of it.

THE NATURE OF WAR

Here the problem of debating the war is changing, because the nature of modern war is changing. The old classical war of open invasions across marked frontiers in defiance of international agreements raised few problems of debate. After Pearl Harbor there was only one honorable course of action open to the Nation, but Vietnam is a much more complicated proposition, subject to many different interpretations and possible responses, and it is probably only the beginning of a long series of such tangles.

The Communists have seen to it in Vietnam—and they will no doubt do so elsewhere—that we are confronted with highly ambiguous situations, where the arguments are not clear but vague, and any course of action or even inaction may be risky.

CHOICE OF WARS

They are choosing limited objectives on terrain favorable to themselves, and hoping to confront us with a choice of unlimited war, which they know we will not choose except in self-preservation, or limited war, which they feel we do not have the patience or the will to endure.

It is a cunning strategy. It forces Washington to yield or fight on Communist terms in unnatural surroundings, with unstable and divided allies, and it confuses public opinion in this country. There is an odd paradox in the American character. On the one hand we have a strong aversion to war, but on the other, once it has started, we are violently pugnacious. We don't like bombing for anything but obvious self-preservation; but, on the other hand, we are reluctant either to fight it out on the ground with our own men or give up.

Dealing with this tangle of military, political and moral ambiguities requires the most careful analysis and balancing of judgments. Nothing is easier than to find fault with whatever is done, and nothing harder than to find precisely the delicate line between provocation and effective retaliation.

Obviously, everybody has the right to say anything he likes about all this, to demonstrate or petition or sit down on the White House lawn. Students who want to "stop the bombing" or "get out of Vietnam" may be right—this is a question not of fact but of judgment—but the consequences of each policy has to be weighed, and this will require more study and thought in the kind of war now being waged than ever before.

ON FINDING FAULT

Meanwhile, the perennial misunderstanding between the men of action and the men of thought will probably go on. "The men who write," said that intellectual, President Woodrow Wilson, "love proportion; the men who act must strike out practical lines of action and neglect proportion * * *. Here unquestionably we come upon the heart of the misunderstanding between the men who write and the men who act."

Nobody here is asking that discussion be stopped, not even Secretary Rusk. Nobody is suggesting that all this be left to the President, except maybe the President. The debate will have to go on, but it will not be effective unless it concentrates a little more, not on the past but on the hard dilemmas of the present.

Rumanian National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people. Here in the United States we are privileged to know the meaning of this annual event, and in like spirit, we commemorate the day of Rumanian independence.

Rumania proclaimed her independence on May 10, 1877. She severed the bonds which previously had linked her to the Ottoman Empire. Liberty was dearly fought for. In 1878, the Congress of Berlin recognized the independence of Rumania and accorded her official status.

In 1881, the land became a kingdom and thereafter, for many decades, the

country was a model of stability and peaceful progress.

The tragic ramifications of World War II altered the complexion of affairs. The nation remains dominated by the Soviet Union, ruled by her, subjected to an outside and foreign ideology.

I hope that the 10th of May will serve to remind us that once the flame of liberty has been set afire, it can never completely be extinguished. The Rumanian people have suffered much throughout the Russian interference. They are still oppressed by a ruthless foreign invader.

Let us hope, in commemorating Rumania's national holiday, that freedom will be restored to this brave people.

American Veterans Honor Congressman
Zablocki

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the 20th National Convention of AMVETS honored a group of distinguished Americans for their important contribution to our Nation.

Included in this group was our very distinguished colleague, Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI. He received the Silver Helmet Award for his leadership in foreign affairs and for his many activities in behalf of veterans.

The Silver Helmet Award, a replica of the World War II GI helmet, was voted to Congressman ZABLOCKI by the 1964 national convention of AMVETS in Philadelphia last August.

I believe that we in the House share a just pride in seeing our colleague honored for his tireless effort in leadership in foreign affairs.

I should like to include in the RECORD today the very moving citation which was presented to Congressman ZABLOCKI along with the Silver Helmet Award.

Our colleague is certainly, without question, a most worthy recipient of this highly coveted award.

Mr. Speaker, the AMVET citation follows:

AMVETS NATIONAL CITATION

The 20th National Convention of AMVETS assembled in Philadelphia, Pa., on August 30, 1964, did unanimously resolve that its congressional award be presented to the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Congressman from Wisconsin, ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in recognition of his numerous contributions to the public interest, his leadership in foreign affairs, his many activities in behalf of veterans, and his interest in AMVETS.

Congressman ZABLOCKI has a consistent record of supporting legislation in the interest of the average taxpayer, the farmer, the small businessman, and all veterans. He has supported, extended, and improved social security, and he was the original sponsor in 1953 of legislation to lower the retirement age for women and to authorize payment of benefits to disabled workers. Both proposals

were approved by Congress and enacted into law.

The Congressman has also consistently supported a strong national defense, the mutual security program, the Hoover Commission's recommendations for streamlining Government operations, reductions in Federal spending, and tax reforms. He has worked hard for measures to strengthen the internal security of the Nation and to combat the Communist menace at home and abroad.

Congressman ZABLOCKI introduced the legislation to authorize construction of the new 1,250-bed Veterans' Administration Hospital at Wood, Wis. The project was approved and the hospital has been constructed. This hospital is an important Veterans' Administration medical center, serving veterans throughout the midwest.

The Congressman has been a champion of the VA center, working actively for its progress and well-being.

The VA hospital at Wood is only one example of the Congressman's interest and efforts in behalf of veterans. He has also pioneered in the establishment of nursing care and rehabilitation programs for veterans. Over the years, Congressman ZABLOCKI has given his full support to legislation providing equitable compensation and other benefits for servicemen and veterans. In addition, there has not been an AMVET problem in which Congressman ZABLOCKI has refused to take an interest.

For his numerous contributions to the public interest, for his leadership in foreign affairs, for his many activities in behalf of veterans, and for his interest in AMVETS, the Silver Helmet Congressional Award is presented to Congressman CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

Presented April 3, 1965.

LINCOLN S. TAMRAZ,
National Commander.AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for
Constantinople and Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a number of U.S. citizens have watched with growing concern the campaign directed against Greek nationals living in Istanbul. On April 19 the Government of Turkey announced its decision to expel the remaining 2,800 Greeks in Istanbul.

The Government also announced its intention to impose controls on the ecumenical patriarchate of the Greek Orthodox Church in Istanbul. This decision raises a grave question of religious freedom and could encourage the Soviet Union to attempt to exercise further influence over religious affairs.

Although the Department of State has not publicly expressed its concern over this matter, many people are alarmed. Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts, has declared the week of May 9-15 AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus and expressed his support for action by our Government "to bring about the freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey."

May 10, 1965

Under unanimous consent I include the Governor's proclamation and a recent article from the London Economist of April 24, which discusses the situation, in the RECORD.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the Christians of Constantinople are being expelled and persecuted and their properties are being confiscated without compensation; and

Whereas the hierarchy and the clergy of the ancient and venerable Eastern Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople are being persecuted, deprived of the right to exercise their churchly and religious functions and some of the hierarchy are being exiled unjustly; and

Whereas the people of Cyprus are seeking the right to establish a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom and equal educational, economic and social opportunities; and

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, otherwise known as the Order of Ahepa, is seeking redress and a solution of these problems in accordance with the American principles and traditions originally enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and which, ever since, have become the cornerstone of the ideals, beliefs and traditions of the American people and government: Now, therefore,

I proclaim the week of May 9-15, 1965, as Massachusetts Ahepa Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus.

I endorse the basic principle of the U.S. foreign policy on self-determination for all peoples and earnestly urge our Government to fully implement and support this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to stop the persecution and exiling of the Christian people of Constantinople.

I further urge on all our citizens of all creeds to participate in the Ahepa Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus, and to pray for a just solution of the problems and the establishment of a just and permanent peace in these ancient places where civilization was born and where all our great religions were first promulgated and established.

JOHN A. VOLPE,
Governor.

[From the London Economist, Apr. 24, 1965]
GREECE AND TURKEY: NOT THE WAY TO WIN FRIENDS

"It is impossible to proceed to any understanding with the Turkish Government under pressure or threat of violent action." This was the response of the Greek foreign minister, Mr. Costopoulos, to Ankara's latest attempt to press a sense of urgency about Cyprus on the Greek Government. Turkey's decision, announced on April 19 to expel the remaining Greek nationals from Istanbul and to impose controls on the affairs of the ecumenical patriarchate of the Greek church in Istanbul, is seen in Athens as a mark of Ankara's impatience to get the Cyprus problem out of the way. From the Turkish point of view, the resumption of Greek-Turkish friendship is dependent on finding a quick solution to the bitter unease in Cyprus. But, the Greeks ask, is this the way?

Ankara's action has come at a time when it had been hoped that the Greek and Turkish foreign ministers might have seized the opportunity of the spring session of the NATO Council of Ministers in London (to be held on May 9 to 11) for preliminary discussions on Cyprus. "We shall sit at the same table to

discuss NATO affairs since we are allies," Mr. Costopoulos told your correspondent, "but we cannot carry on bilateral talks. It is a question of dignity."

The decision to expel the remaining 2,800 Greeks from Turkey (most of whom live in Istanbul) is an irritation rather than a serious worry to the Greek Government. Already several thousand once-prosperous Greeks have been repatriated from there, and the addition of more will cause only mounting annoyance. It is the question of the ecumenical patriarchate that is causing anxiety. The fear is the effect the Turkish action may have on the Soviet Union.

The Greeks claim to be alarmed in case it might encourage the Russians to do one of two things. They might now press for the removal of the ecumenical patriarchate from the See of Constantinople with a possible view to misappropriating the primacy of the Orthodox church to Moscow's own patriarchate. Or, on the contrary, they might intervene in support of the ecumenical patriarchate against Turkish pressures, and so enhance Russia's prestige throughout the Orthodox world.

The Turkish prime minister's statement on Tuesday that, if "inhuman and unbearable" actions continued in Cyprus, his Government would have to reconsider the Treaty of Lausanne has prompted the Greeks to remark that the treaty, which in 1923 established a delicate balance of power across the Aegean, did not merely grant Greece privileges for its own minority and church in Istanbul. It also, as a counterbalance for Turkey, gave rights to the 100,000-strong Moslem minority living in Greece's western Thrace. But so far they are only pointing this out; Greek officials say that they earnestly hope that the situation will not reach the point when Greece is forced to answer threat with counterthreat.

The Anatomy of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, the voices of extremism are loud in the land as zealots of the right and left clamor for center stage before a public audience that is seeking to resolve in a responsible way the multitude of complex problems which we face at home and abroad.

And while the irresponsible antics and pronouncements of extremists—from the recent trial summation by a Klan lawyer in Haynesville, Ala., to the "conservative" convention in Chicago, to demonstrations and harangues hither and yon by so-called campus "peace" groups—garb headlines they do not reflect the true American mood.

Yet extremists of all hues—and they abound in our political spectrum as do the colors of a rainbow—present a clear and present danger to the body politic.

While our form of government dictates that we must tolerate some of their theatrics and most of their taunts, it also gives responsible citizens license to use truth as a weapon against their turbid and turbulent ideologies.

As the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times clearly points out, a vigilant, concerned public can accelerate the

process of self-destruction inherent in extremist movements:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times,
Apr. 11, 1965]

THE ANATOMY OF EXTREMISM

Periodically, in the history of this Republic, there have emerged during times of stress extremist cults and movements of various stripe. They often rally under patriotic banners. But they are dedicated nonetheless to assaulting by word and deed certain basic institutions and tenets of American society.

In the 1840's and 1850's the Nation suffered, and survived, the Know Nothings. In the 1930's, amidst the fear of the great depression, both Fascist and Communist organizations flourished. At other times, in less organized ways, we have endured other divisive, truly un-American movements, which preached hatred of class, or race, or religion, or democracy.

These have not been nor are they today welcome experiences. Living through them has sometimes left scars. In every case, however, the fundamental strengths of our political and social structure have readily absorbed the attacks of internal foes.

This is not to minimize or discount the inherent threat posed by organized extremist movements. These are ugly, intolerable manifestations whenever and wherever they occur.

Whether of right or left, extremists are a departure from both the ideal and practice of American national life. And when hate, which so easily is expressed through violence, is the chief mark of extremism, the aberration is even more alarming.

We live now, as we have for some decades past and as we no doubt will for some time to come, in an uneasy world. Fears, real and imagined, vague and precise, surround us. Within and without our borders, great and unusual transformations are taking place.

Old values are questioned and sometimes discarded without being replaced. What once were sureties making for stability—of belonging, of participation, of individual worth—now seem frequently in doubt.

In this changing climate a sense of frustration, a feeling by the individual that life is wasted or spoiled, can be easily nourished. Widespread frustration, with all its ambiguities, is the commonest breeding ground of extremism. It is from among the frustrated that the zealots, the "true believers," are recruited for extremist movements.

Regardless of the cause to which he dedicates himself, the extremist in every case seems motivated and compelled by an inner turmoil, for which he invents elaborate and high-sounding rationalizations. This is true whether he is a college youth eagerly enlisting in a far-left crusade, or a goon marching in a bedsheet, or a man in a business suit conspiring to take over a PTA—or a local police force.

The raw material for making extremists has always been with us and, given human nature, always will be. The existence of this fortunately limited element in our midst is not itself alarming. Extremism in any form, thanks to the basic commonsense of Americans, has never yet grown into a mass movement.

What is alarming is the chance that passivity, preoccupation, and apathy on the part of the overwhelming majority of decent Americans will permit one or more extremist movements to assume a strength far out of proportion to its size. Then it may prove too late to do anything about it.

This has happened in other countries.

Despite the phrases they mouth or the flags in which they wrap themselves, extremists can be readily identified. For what distinguishes them all is a basic hatred and contempt for American society as it exists today. That hatred, however disguised, gives ex-